

**United States Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management
Coeur d'Alene District, Idaho
Cottonwood Field Office
1 Butte Drive
Cottonwood, ID 83522**

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS

Special Recreation Permit for Commercial Outfitting In Game Management Unit 11
BLM-ID-C020-2012-0018-EA

Finding

Based upon review of the Revised Environmental Assessment (EA), I have determined that the proposed action to issue the Recreation Permit for Commercial Outfitting in Game Management Unit 11 will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment. Therefore, preparation of an environmental impact statement is not required. As described and analyzed in the EA, no environmental effects meet the definition of significance as defined by regulations to implement NEPA found at 40 CFR 1508.27. This finding is based on my consideration of both the context and intensity of the project, as described below.

Context

This means that the significance of an action was analyzed in several contexts such as society as a whole (human, national), the affected region, the affected interests, and the locality. Significance varies with the setting of the proposed action. For instance, in the case of a site-specific action, significance would usually depend upon the effects in the local rather than in the world as a whole. Both short-and-long-term effects are relevant.

The BLM proposes reissuing a SRP for commercial outfitting on 25,182 acres of public land in GMU 11. The CFO coordinated this permit with the Idaho Outfitter & Guides Licensing Board and Idaho Department of Fish and Game. As described in the Revised EA, the project area is limited in size and effects of the activities are limited in duration. Beneficial and adverse effects are local in nature and not likely to significantly affect regional or national resources.

BLM previously authorized a temporary SRP for commercial use in GMU 11 for the same types of use as identified in the new proposes permit. The temporary permit has been in use since 1991, and has resulted in no significant adverse impacts to resources in the authorized area. The new proposed action will limit the number of outfitter clients for different types of activities, in the past there were never restrictions on the number of outfitted clients.

Intensity

This requirement refers to the severity of impact. The following factors are considered in evaluating intensity.

1. Impacts that may be both beneficial and adverse.

Beneficial impacts include offering a service to the public to hire a commercial outfitter to conduct commercial hunting, day hikes, mountain bike tours, photography, and backpacking trips. Adverse impacts would include temporary foot traffic impacts to areas being used during commercial activities and some vehicle traffic; however design measures in the stipulations will minimize adverse effects and can be modified to address any resource or safety concerns that might arise in the future.

2. The degree to which the proposed action affects public health or safety.

Design measures in the stipulations will minimize effects on public health and safety and stipulations for the permit can be modified to address any resource or safety concerns that might arise in the future.

3. Unique characteristics of the geographic area such as proximity to historic or cultural resources, park lands, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, or ecologically critical areas.

Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACECs)

As described in the Revised EA, the proposed action would have no measurable or appreciable effects to ACEC values

Wild and Scenic River Status

Although a portion of the suitable segment of the Lower Salmon River would be included in the area authorized for use under the proposed action, the proposed commercial activities are land based recreation and, as described in the Revised EA, would not affect Outstanding Remarkable Values.

4. The degree to which the effects on the quality of the human environment are likely to be highly controversial.

One point of potential controversy, the proposed number of permitted clients, was identified by IDFG during the public review of the original EA. However, the BLM consulted with IDFG and revised the proposed action of the Revised EA, thereby eliminating this controversy.

5. The degree to which the possible effects on the human environment are highly uncertain or involve unique or unknown risks.

This proposed activity is similar to numerous other commercial activities found on BLM lands throughout the Pacific Northwest. The Proposed Action is not expected to provide any measurable effects on the human environment and produce no highly uncertain or unique or unknown risks. The activity will minimize effects on the quality of human environment and design measures in the stipulations for the permit can be modified to address any resource or safety concerns that might arise in the future.

6. The degree to which the action may establish a precedent for future actions with significant effects or represents a decision in principle about a future consideration.

This proposed activity is similar to numerous other commercial activities found on BLM lands throughout the Pacific Northwest. The Proposed Action is not precedent setting in nature nor does it represent a decision in principle about a future consideration.

7. Whether the action is related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant impacts.

The Revised EA does not identify any related actions that would result in cumulatively significant impacts.

8. The degree to which the action may adversely affect districts, sites, highways, structures, or objects listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places or may cause loss or destruction of significant scientific, cultural, or historical resources.

The Proposed Action is not anticipated to result in adverse effects to cultural or historic resources located in the proposed commercial use area. As such, the Proposed Action is expected to have no effect on scientific, cultural or historical resources. Design measures in the stipulations for the permit can be modified to address any resource or safety concerns that might arise in the future.

9. The degree to which the action may adversely affect an endangered or threatened species or its critical habitat that has been determined under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended.

Aquatic Habitat and Special Status Species (EA 3.2.7)

The proposed SRP would have stipulations to avoid or minimize adverse effects to ESA-listed and BLM sensitive fish species, and aquatic/riparian habitats (see Appendix 1). A “no effect” determination was concluded for ESA-listed and BLM sensitive fish and designated critical habitat for ESA-listed fish.

*Special Status Wildlife and Plants (EA 3.2.6)*The SRP would be subject to existing policy, rules, and regulations, and contains stipulations to avoid or minimize any adverse effects to BLM species and suitable habitats (see Appendix 1). As discussed in the Revised EA, habitat impacts effects to BLM sensitive plants would result in no measurable or appreciable effect with the SRP stipulations. Increased commercial recreational use would result in minor or localized potential for soil or vegetation disturbance, however, with restrictions regarding off-road vehicle use and use of camp sites on BLM lands, no measurable or appreciable adverse impacts to sensitive

species habitats is expected. Overall, BLM sensitive species population levels and trends, and habitat conditions and trends would be expected to continue for the analysis area.

Overall, because dispersed commercial recreational uses would occur over a variety of habitats and different time periods, a conservative determination of “*may impact individuals or habitats, but will not likely lead to a trend toward federal listing*” is concluded for the BLM sensitive wildlife species identified in Appendix 2, Tables 1 – 3. However, it is recognized that annually the majority of species identified in Appendix 2, Tables 1 -3 would probably have “*no impact*” to the species or preferred habitats.

10. Whether the action threatens a violation of Federal, State, or Local law or requirements imposed for the protection of the environment.

The action will not violate other Federal, State, or local laws or requirements for the protection of the environment. The activity will minimize effects and design measures in the stipulations for the permit can be modified to address any resource or safety concerns that might arise in the future.

/s/ Robbin Boyce for

7/1/15

Will Runnoe
Field Manager

Date